UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/588,720	01/10/2007	Patrick Moireau	294251US0PCT	1968	
22850 7590 11/02/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER		
			GRAY, JILL M		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1798			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/02/2010	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/588,720	MOIREAU ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jill Gray	1798	

	Jill Gray	1798	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 October 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS <i>A</i>	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, leading they raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially rec	idening of simplifying the	ile issues ioi
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•	
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu Applicants' arguments have been considered but are no requires "a polyacrylic." This language is broad and doe teaches the advantages of forming conductive composit comprise conductive particles in flake form. This teaching electrically conducting particles in flake form being used advantages of carbon flakes in forming electrically conductive particles.	t found to be persuasive. As to the es not exclude the polyacrylates of Lions that can be used on glass subsing would have suggested to the skil as a coating on glass substrates.	polyacrylates of Lin, a in. As to the teaching strates wherein the co led artisan the advan	applicants' claim gs of Miller, he empositions tages of
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).			
13.  Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

**Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)** 

Application No.

/Jill Gray/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1798

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20101026

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment to claim 1 raises new issues because the incorporation of the limitations of claim 3 into claim 1 now results in claim 2 being broader than claim 1. Claim 2 requires that the film former be a polymer, which is broader than the now specifically defined film formers. Also, because claim 3 originally depended on claim 2, this amendment does not constitute merely rewriting claim 3 as an independent claim (which is permissible if claim 3 depended upon claim 1). Moreover, the proposed amendment to claim 9 raises new issues because claim 9 previously was not limited to any particular type of film forming agent.